

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-11, 13-15, and 30-31 are currently pending in this application. Claims 17-29 and 32 have been canceled by this reply, without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 13, 30, and 31 are independent. The remaining claims depend from claims 1 and 13.

Claim Objections

Claims 3-5, 14, 18-20 and 28 are objected to for minor informalities. Claims 18-20 and 28 are canceled by this reply, thus this objection is now moot with respect to the canceled claims. Claims 3-5 and 14 have been amended to correct the misspellings pointed out by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 is objected to for reciting “service descriptor” instead of “service description.” Claim 8 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner’s suggestion. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1, 13, 30, and 31 have been amended for purposes of clarification. No new matter is added by way of these amendments. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, at least on Figure 3 and pages 4, 24, and 25 of the Specification.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 17-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 17-26 have been canceled by this reply; thus, this rejection is now moot.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 6-11, 13, 15, 17, 21-27 and 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by the European Telecommunication Standard (ETS). Claims 17, 21-27, 29, and 32 have been canceled by this reply; thus, this rejection is now moot with respect to the canceled claims. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention recites, in part, (i) a plurality of packet transport streams, (ii) *each* of which carry at least one bouquet related table (BRT), and (iii) transmitting at least two different bouquet related tables each containing information relating to a respective different commercial bouquet. Thus, the claimed invention requires a table that provides an overview of the entire bouquet related tables in the network and their location within at least one of a plurality of transport streams. This enables a receiving device to quickly and effectively identify and filter out a required bouquet related table. Further, limitation (iii) avoids recopying of a service that belongs to two different commercial bouquets. Said another way, by enabling a bouquet to “spread” across a plurality of transport streams, the copying of a service to a number of different transport streams can be avoided. *See* Specification, pages 4, 24, and 25.

In contrast to the claimed invention, ETS is a standard that defines characteristics of a number of data tables having fixed PID and TID values. In particular, one such table described by ETS is the Bouquet Association Table (BAT). The BAT contains information regarding a

“bouquet” of communication services provided by an information provider over a communication network. *See* ETS, pages 17-19. Such services may include games, movies, music, etc. The sections of the BAT described in ETS are not independent data tables. Rather, they are merely fragments of a unified BAT, sized to fit within standardized packets. One commercial operation is responsible for the content of a plurality of services channels that are grouped as a bouquet of services. The BAT table for that bouquet has a fixed PID and TID value. The BAT table may also include additional information relating to the bouquet of services, such as subscription details. In ETS, one transport stream contains only a single BAT table, which may easily be located and downloaded by a decoder.

ETS does not disclose or even contemplate the provision of a bouquet containing resources from a *plurality* of transport streams, as required by the amended independent claims. Rather, the BAT table of ETS relates to services *within a single transport stream only*. Further, ETS fails to disclose or suggest that any of the BAT table fragments or sections identify in which transport stream the BAT table for a given bouquet can be found. Further, ETS is completely silent with respect to limitation (iii) above, as ETS does not include more than one BRT in one transport stream, much less two different BRTs that include information about two different commercial bouquets.

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that the Examiner’s contentions do not support the rejection of the amended independent claims. Thus, amended independent claims 1, 13, 30 and 31 are patentable over ETS. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-5 14, 18-20, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ETS in view of US Patent No. 6,081,801 (“Cochrane”). Claims 18-20 and 28 are canceled by this reply; thus, this rejection is now moot with respect to the canceled claims. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, ETS fails to teach or suggest the limitations of the amended independent claims. Further, Cochrane fails to supply that which ETS lacks, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on Cochrane solely for the purpose of teaching a NIT comprising a list of bouquet values associated with a plurality of the transport streams of a network. *See* Office Action mailed March 24, 2008, p. 7-8.

Thus, it is clear that the Examiner’s contentions fail to support the rejection of the amended independent claims. Thus, independent claims 1 and 13 are patentable over ETS and Cochrane, whether considered separately or in combination. Pending dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 11345/033001).

Dated: 9/18/2008

Respectfully submitted,

By JPS #45,079
f Jonathan P. Osha *Thomas Scherer*
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant